

**REMARKS**

In an office action dated 21 May 2004, the Examiner rejects claims 19-34 (all pending claims) and objects to the drawings. In response to the rejections, Applicants amend claims 19, 20, 27, and 28. Applicants also cancel claims 21, 22, 29 and 30. Applicant also respectfully traverses the rejections. Claims 19-20, 23-28, and 31-34 remain in the application. In light of the argument set forth below, Applicants respectfully request that all pending claims be allowed.

Applicants have reviewed the action dated 19 December 2001 and find nothing in the detailed action stating an objection to the drawings. Applicants never received A Notice of Draftpersons Review that was indicated as included in the office action of 19 December 2001. Applicants will be more than happy to correct any informalities if the Examiner provides either a proper objection or A Notice of Draftpersons Review which was never received.

The Examiner also rejects claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,061,692 issued to Thomas et al, (Thomas). In order to maintain a rejection the Examiner has the burden of providing evidence of prima facie obviousness. See MPEP §2143. See also In Re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In order to prove prima facie obviousness, the Examiner must provide evidence in the prior art of a motivation to combine or modify a reference, a reasonable expectation of success, and a teaching of each and every claimed element. Id.

Claim 19 recites a limitation of setting a notification flag in the record wherein the notification flag indicates that a notification is required in response to a change of the configuration data. Thomas does not teach this limitation. The cited portions of Thomas that are cited teach setting flags in a notification message that indicate the type of change made. There is no teaching of setting a notification flag in the record responsive to the notification request to indicate notifications are required. Thomas teaches registration for notification and notification in figure 12

A and 12B and at Col. 26, line 39- Col. 27, line 17. This section does not teach a precise manner for registering or notifying. Thus, there is no teaching of the use of a notification flag in the record as recited in claim 19. Thus, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 19 be removed and claim 19 be allowed.

Claims 20, 23-26 are dependent from claim 19. Thus, claims 20, and 23-26 are allowable over the prior art for at least the same reasons as claim 19. Thus applicants respectfully request the rejections to claims 20 and 23-26 be removed and claims 20, and 23-26 be allowed.

Claim 27 recites a method performed by the product of claim 19. Thus, claim 27 is allowable for at least the same reason as claim 19. Therefore, the rejection of claim 27 must be removed. For this reason, Applicants respectfully request claim 27 be allowed.


Claims 28, and 31-34 are dependent from claim 27. Thus, claims 28, and 31-34 are allowable over the prior art for at least the same reasons as claim 27. Thus applicants respectfully request the rejections to claims 28, and 31-34 be removed and claims 28, and 31-34 be allowed.

The Examiner may telephone the undersigned at 775-586-9500 to discuss any questions regarding this response or the application in general.

Respectfully submitted,  
Sierra Patent Group, Ltd.

Dated: August 23, 2004

Sierra Patent group, Ltd.  
P.O. Box 6149  
Stateline, NV 89449  
(775) 586-9500



William P. Wilbar  
Reg. No. 43,265